Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application, and are rejected in the Office Action of July 21, 2009. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are amended herein to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention.

Re: Patentability of Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,371,551 issued to Logan et al. (hereinafter, "Logan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,328 issued to Elliot et al. (hereinafter, "Elliot"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

At the outset, Applicants again note that the claimed invention addresses and solves a problem related to how to provide a simplified peer-to-peer recording method and apparatus (see title). The claimed solution to this problem is defined by amended independent claim 1, for example, as follows:

> "A method for operating a television apparatus having a digital serial bus connection to enable a recording function, the method comprising the steps of:
>
> 'receiving, by the television apparatus, a user input selecting a designated video input source device connected via the digital serial bus connection;
>
> 'in response to the user input received by the television apparatus, establishing, by the television apparatus, a peer-to-peer connection between the designated video input source device and a digital recording device connected via the digital serial bus connection; and
>
> 'further in response to the user input received by the television apparatus, causing, by the television apparatus, the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the designated video input source device, wherein data is directly transferred between the designated video input source device and the digital recording device." (emphasis added)

As indicated above, independent claim 1 defines a method which advantageously provides simplified peer-to-peer recording. According to this claimed method, a television apparatus enables at least three different functions to be performed in response to a "user input" received by the television apparatus, namely, the functions of: (i) selecting a designated video input source device, (ii) establishing a peer-to-peer connection between the designated video input source device and a digital recording device; and (iii) causing the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the designated video input source device, wherein data is directly transferred between the designated video input source device and the digital recording device. That is, one of the key features of the claimed invention is that the television apparatus controls the designated video input source device (e.g., set-top box, etc.) and the digital recording device independently, but data flows directly between the designated video input source device (e.g., set-top box, etc.) and the digital recording device (see, for example, page 4, lines 11-22 of the specification). Independent claims 7 and 13 recite subject matter similar to independent claim 1, as described above.

Neither Logan nor Elliot, whether taken individually or in combination, discloses or suggests the simplified peer-to-peer recording solution defined by independent claims 1, 7 and 13. On page 3 of the Office Action dated July 21, 2009, the Examiner alleges (with respect to claim 1) the following:

> "... Logan discloses a method for operating a television apparatus to enable a recording function..., the method comprising the steps of:
>
> 'receiving, by the television apparatus, a user input selecting a designated video input source device connected to the television apparatus (Col. 3, lines 24-27 and 54-57 fig 1; turning on the device and implementing switching node 3 to select an input unit 4);
>
> 'in response to the user input received by the television apparatus, establishing a connection between the designated video input source device and a digital recording device connected to the digital serial bus (Col. 1 lines 46-60, col. 3 lines 8-23 and figure 1; connecting input source unit 4 and memory system 5);

'and further in response to the user input received by the television apparatus, causing the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the designated video input source device, wherein data may be directly transferred between the designated video input source device and the digital recording device (Col. 1 lines 46-60, col. 3 lines 54-57 and figure 1; continuously storing currently received content in a circular buffer)." (emphasis added)

As indicated above, the Examiner alleges that Logan discloses most of the features of independent claim 1. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Logan discloses a television apparatus which, in response to a user input received by the television apparatus, enables the functions of: (i) selecting a designated video input source device, (ii) establishing a connection between the designated video input source device and a digital recording device; and (iii) causing the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the designated video input source device, wherein data is directly transferred between the designated video input source device and the digital recording device.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, Logan discloses a broadcast recording and playback device employing a circular buffer memory which constantly records one or more incoming audio or video program signals and a microprocessor for reading a playback signal from the circular buffer memory to display programming material delayed from its receipt by a selectable delay interval. A plurality of input signal processors provides one or more programming signals to the circular buffer memory in compressed digital form and a separate output signal processor converts the compressed digital information read from the circular buffer memory into a form suitable for display. The device operates under the control of the microprocessor which accepts commands from a remote command device or a connected host computer (see, for example, the Abstract). Applicants further note that the Examiner specifically cites the following passages of Logan: column 1, lines 46-60; column 3, lines 8-27 and 54-57; and FIG. 1.

However, Applicants submit that none of the aforementioned cited passages of Logan (nor any of the remaining passages thereof) discloses or suggests, *inter alia*, that a given user input received at a single television apparatus is capable of enabling the performance of at least three different functions, including: (i) selecting a designated video input source device, (ii) establishing a connection between the designated video input source device and a digital recording device; and (iii) causing

the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the designated video input source device, as recited by independent claims 1, 7 and 13.

Elliot is unable to remedy the aforementioned deficiencies of Logan. In particular, Elliot discloses a system including a set-top box 100 connectable to a digital video recorder 200 (see FIG. 1-3). Digital video recorder 200 receives a real-time video signal 106 from set-top box 100 and provides a recorded video signal 108 to set-top box 100 during a playback interval. D igital v ideo recorder 200 also includes a disk 220 and a video data stream manager 230 that in response to real-time video signal 106 provides a first video stream 222 to store a selected video segment on disk 220. Video data stream manager 230, in response to commands from a microprocessor 140 in set-top box 100, receives a second video stream 223 based on the selected video segment stored on disk 220 to generate recorded video signal 108. Set-top box 100 also includes a multiplexer 150 that selects real-time video signal 106 during a real-time interval and selects recorded video signal 108 during the playback interval to generate an output video data stream to a display device 30 0 (see, for example, the Abstract, FIGS. 1-3 and their accompanying descriptions).

However, as pointed out in Applicants' last response, Elliot clearly fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, that a given user input received at a single television apparatus is capable of enabling the performance of at least three different functions, including: (i) selecting a designated video input source device, (ii) establishing a peer-to-peer connection between the designated video input source device and a digital recording device; and (iii) causing the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the designated video input source device, as recited by independent claims 1, 7 and 13.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 7 and 13 and their respective dependent claims are patentable over the proposed combination of Logan and Elliot, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Re: Patentability of Claims 5, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Elliot, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,882 issued to Geer et al. (hereinafter, "Geer"). Claims 5, 11 and 15 each ultimately depend from either independent claim 1, 7 or 13 described above. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the same reasons pointed out above in conjunction with independent claims 1, 7 and 13 since Geer is unable to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Logan and Elliot. In particular, Geer discloses a digital video recorder that is capable of concurrently receiving and digitally storing a plurality of channels (see, for example, the Abstract).

However, like Logan and Elliot, Geer nowhere discloses or suggests, *inter alia*, that a given user input received at a single television apparatus is capable of enabling the performance of at least three different functions, including the functions of: (i) selecting a designated video input source device, (ii) establishing a peer-to-peer connection between the designated video input source device and a digital recording device; and (iii) causing the digital recording device to record digital content provided from the designated video input source device, as provided by independent claims 1, 7 and 13. As such, Geer (like Logan and Elliot) also fails to disclose or suggest the desirability of the claimed solution for providing simplified peer-to-peer recording. Accordingly, claims 5, 11 and 15 are deemed patentable over the proposed combination of Logan, Elliot and Geer, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CUSTOMER NO.: 24498
Serial No.: 10/578,952
Office Action dated: 07/21/09
Response dated: 10/12/09

PATENT
PU030295

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks/arguments and accompanying amendments, the Applicants believe this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled. No fee is believed due from this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee, and/or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD ANDREW LE FEVRE ET AL.

By: _____

Paul P. Kiel, Attorney
Reg. No. 40,677
Phone (609) 734-6815

PPK:pdf

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

October 12, 2009
13